

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
LAREDO DIVISION

|                                 |   |                                 |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,       | § |                                 |
|                                 | § |                                 |
| Plaintiff,                      | § |                                 |
| VS.                             | § | CRIMINAL ACTION NO. L-05-2455-1 |
|                                 | § |                                 |
| PABLO LECOUS-ALVAREZ; aka PABLO | § |                                 |
| LESUS-ALVAREZ,                  | § |                                 |
|                                 | § |                                 |
| Defendant.                      | § |                                 |

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The Magistrate Court submits this Report and Recommendation to the District Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(3). This case has been referred, by order of the District Court, to the United States Magistrate Judge for the taking of a felony guilty plea and the Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure Rule 11 Allocution. All parties executed a waiver of the right to plead guilty before a United States District Judge as well as a consent to proceed before a United States Magistrate Judge.

On December 15, 2005, the defendant and counsel appeared before the Magistrate Judge, who addressed the defendant personally in open court and informed the defendant of the admonishments under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and determined that the defendant was competent to plead guilty and fully understood said admonishments.

The defendant agreed to plead guilty to Count 1 of the Indictment (violation of Title 8, United States Code, Section 1326 and Title 6, United States Code, Sections 202 and 557). Any other counts are to be dismissed at sentencing. **No written plea agreement was entered.** The Court explained that the District Court may consult the Sentencing Guidelines promulgated by the United States Sentencing Commission in determining the defendant's sentence. The Court also explained that the defendant could receive a term of supervised release. The Court

explained the range of punishment with regard to imprisonment, fines, restitution, supervised release, and the statutory fee assessment pursuant to the Victims of Crimes Act.

The Magistrate Judge finds the following:

1. The defendant, with the advice of his attorney, has consented orally and in writing to enter this guilty plea before the Magistrate Judge, subject to final approval and sentencing by the District Judge;
2. The defendant fully understands the nature of the charges and penalties;
3. The defendant understands his Constitutional and statutory rights and wishes to waive these rights;
4. The defendant's plea is made freely and voluntarily;
5. The defendant is competent to enter this plea of guilty; and
6. There is an adequate factual basis for this plea.

#### **Recommendation**

The Magistrate Court **RECOMMENDS** that the District Court accept the plea of guilty and enter final judgment of guilt against the defendant.

#### **Warnings**


The parties may file objections to this Report and Recommendation. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings or recommendations to which objections are being made. The District Court need not consider frivolous, conclusive, or general objections. *Battle v. United States Parole Comm'n* , 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987) (quoting *Nettles v. Wainwright* , 677 F.2d 404, 410 n.8 (5th Cir. 1982) (en banc)).

A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations contained in this Report within ten (10) days after being served with a copy of the Report shall bar that party from *de novo* review by the District Court of the proposed findings and

recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, shall bar the party from appellate review of proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the District Court to which no objections were filed. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150-53 (1985); *Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Report and Recommendation to all parties.

SIGNED this 15th day of December, 2005.



---

Adriana Arce-Flores  
United States Magistrate Judge